

REMARKS

Applicants' representative (Thomas A. Jurecko, Reg. No. 48, 392) would like to thank Examiner Fleming for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted on May 22, 2009. During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) using U.S. Pat. No. 6,698,458 (Sollars) as the primary reference. Applicants' representative discussed Applicants' claims 1 and 10 that call for a fabric woven to have a random or quasi-random distribution of floats. Applicants' representative presented proposed arguments that Sollars discloses a strict, repeating weave pattern to cooperate with a coating film to provide a low air permeability air-bag, as opposed to the random or quasi-random distribution of floats recited in claims 1 and 10. Applicants' representative further discussed proposed additional claims directed to the random or quasi-random distribution of floats being configured to have a non-repeating, irregular weave for improved tear resistance. The Examiner was receptive to the above proposed arguments and additional claims, but also indicated that a further review of the Sollars reference would be required.

Claims 1-14 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Applicants have made minor amendments to claims 2, 4-5 and 9, and have added new claims 11-14 for consideration. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sollars, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,698,458, hereinafter "Sollars") in view of Wallentin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,447,003, hereinafter "Wallentin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that the present teachings provide a mount having an improved, tear-resistant weaving as shown, for example, in FIG. 5. The improved weaving can be formed from a fabric woven to have a random or quasi-random distribution of floats resulting in a non-repeating, irregular weave as shown, for example, in FIG. 1.

Applicants further note that independent claims 1 and 10 call for a mount being formed from fabric, woven to have the random or quasi-random distribution of floats. Applicants respectfully submit that Sollars fails to disclose or even suggest a fabric woven to have such a random or quasi-random distribution of floats.

Rather, Sollars is directed to coating inflatable air-bags to provide improved low air permeability characteristics after inflation. To accomplish this, Sollars discloses having a fabric weaving designed to provide low air permeability. Each layer of the Sollars weaving is not random, but rather has a very strict pattern designed to minimize air permeability. See, for example, col. 4, lns. 16-36. The strict weaving pattern combined with the coating provides for an air-bag with a leak down time of at least five seconds.

Sollars further discloses the specific nature of the strict weaving pattern with reference to FIGS. 1 and 2. In FIG. 1, Sollars describes the repeating nature of double

fabric layers 12, 14, 18, 20, 24, 26 and the repeating nature of the single fabric layers 16, 22. More specifically, the double fabric layers are woven in plain weave patterns and the single fabric layers are woven in basket weave patterns and, as such, neither fabric layer is woven with a random or quasi-random distribution of floats. See col. 13, Ins. 47-55.

Sollars also illustrates a weave diagram 30 in FIG. 2 as being representative of a preferred weaving pattern formed using repeating plain weave and basket weave four-pick arrangements. See col. 13, Ins. 38-40. Three specific weaving patterns are illustrated in FIG. 2, namely a repeating plain weave pattern 32, an “up-down” basket weave pattern 34, and a “down-up” basket weave pattern 36. Again, Sollars discloses another strict weave pattern arrangement that is neither random nor quasi-random in distribution of floats. In fact, Applicants submit that Sollars is completely silent as to using anything other than a fabric woven with a strict weave pattern, let alone a fabric woven to have a random or quasi-random distribution of floats as claimed in independent claims 1 and 10.

Further, Sollars, if anything teaches away from Applicants’ invention as claimed in claims 1 and 10. Specifically, claims 1 and 10 recite a mount formed from fabric, woven to have a random or quasi-random distribution of floats. In contrast, Sollars discloses the opposite -- a non-random, repeating weave pattern as well as the specific benefits attributed to using such a non-random weave pattern with a coating film to arrive at the low air permeability air-bag.

Applicants further submit that Wallentin fails to cure the deficiencies of Sollars noted above.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over Sollars, whether taken alone or in combination with Wallentin, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Regarding claims 2-9, Applicants note these claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 1-10.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new claims 11-14 for consideration. Claim 11 depends from independent claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 12 recites "at least one mounting tab...being formed from fabric woven to have a random distribution of floats, the random distribution of floats configured to have a non-repeating irregular weave for improved tear resistance." Applicants hereby incorporate their remarks from above with respect to claims 1 and 10 and respectfully submit that Sollars fails to disclose or even suggest fabric woven to have a random distribution of floats configured to have a non-repeating irregular weave for improved tear resistance. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 26 MAY 2009

By: 
Stephen T. Olson, Reg. No. 36,626
Thomas A. Jurecko, Reg. No. 48,392

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

STO/TAJ/pml

14521615